arXiv:1608.06137v2 [math.NT] 24 Aug 2016

MINIMAL RELATIONS AND THE DIOPHANTINE FROBENIUS PROBLEM IN EMBEDDING DIMENSION THREE

ALESSIO MOSCARIELLO

Abstract. This paper provides a formula for the minimal relations and the Frobenius number of a numerical semigroup minimally generated by three pairwise coprime positive integers.

Introduction

Let $n_1, \dots, n_\nu$ be a set of positive integers such that $\gcd(n_1, \dots, n_\nu) = 1$. The *Diophantine Frobenius Problem* (cf. [1]) asks for an explicit formula that determines the largest integer which cannot be expressed as a linear combination with nonnegative integer coefficients of $n_1, \dots, n_\nu$, usually called *Frobenius number* and denoted by $F(n_1, \dots, n_\nu)$. This problem dates back to the end of the nineteenth century: a classical result of Sylvester (cf. [10]) solved the problem for $\nu = 2$, giving the well-known formula $F(n_1, n_2) = n_1 n_2 - n_1 - n_2$. However, as ν grows the problem becomes incredibly complicated: in fact today the problem is still open for $\nu \geq 3$ ([6] is an excellent monograph in that regard). The case $\nu = 3$ has been the main subject of a wide number of papers, and many formulas for particular triples have been found, although the main case still remains unsolved. A noteworthy result of Curtis (cf. [2]) states that it is impossible to find a polynomial formula for $F(n_1, n_2, n_3)$.

Several results (cf. [3], [6], [7]) established a simple relation between the Frobenius number $F(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ and the *minimal relations* between n_1, n_2, n_3, i.e. the smallest positive integers c_i such that $c_i n_i$ is representable as $c_i n_i = \lambda_j n_j + \lambda_k n_k$, where $\lambda_j, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{N}$; therefore, the attention is generally focused on finding formulas or algorithms for the minimal relations c_1, c_2, c_3. Several algorithms are present in the literature (cf. [5], [9]), which compute these relations with the same complexity as Euclid's greatest common divisor algorithm.
The main result of this short paper is a generic formula for the minimal relations, which determines c_i as the minimum element of a certain finite set. Then, a simple application of this result provides a (terrible) non-polynomial formula for $F(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ in function of the minimal generators n_1, n_2, n_3 which involves the operators $\min, \max, \lfloor \cdot \rfloor, \lceil \cdot \rceil$ and the remainder operator $[\cdot]$., which partly explains its irregular behaviour.

In Section 1 we recall several preliminary results, in order to define our context and give the necessary background, while Section 2 is devoted to prove the main result (Theorem 7). At the end of this Section, the formula for $F(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ is stated (Theorem 8). Finally, we conclude this work with some considerations on the results obtained.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11D75, 11D07, 20M14.
Key words and phrases. Frobenius problem, numerical semigroups, minimal relations.

1. Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of nonnegative integers. A *numerical semigroup* is a submonoid $\mathcal{S}$ of $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ such that $\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is finite. Each numerical semigroup admits a finite set of minimal generators $\mathcal{G}$ (we use the standard notation $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$), and it is easy to deduce that the condition on $\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is equivalent to $\gcd(\mathcal{G}) = 1$. The *Frobenius number* of a numerical semigroup $\mathcal{S}$ is the largest element of $\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{S}$, and is commonly denoted by $F(\mathcal{S})$.

The first Theorem we need is based on the classical result of Sylvester (cf. [10],[7]), and studies numerical semigroups minimally generated by two positive integers.

Theorem 1. *Let n_1, n_2 be two coprime positive integers greater than 2, and let $S = \langle n_1, n_2 \rangle$. Then*

$$F(\mathcal{S}) = n_1 n_2 - n_1 - n_2.$$

Moreover, if $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{S}$, then $F(\mathcal{S}) - m \in \mathcal{S}$.

This result plays, surprisingly, a crucial role in our investigation; in particular, the implication $m \notin \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{S} \Longrightarrow F(\mathcal{S}) - m \in \mathcal{S}$ provides the basic idea of our approach.

Now, let n_1, n_2, n_3 be positive integers such that $\gcd(n_1, n_2, n_3) = 1$, and consider the numerical semigroup $\mathcal{S} = \langle n_1, n_2, n_3 \rangle$. From now on, we assume that n_1, n_2, n_3 is the minimal system of generators for $\mathcal{S}$ (i.e. each n_i is not representable as a linear combination of the other two). The following Proposition reduces our problem to the case of pairwise coprime integers n_1, n_2, n_3.

Proposition 2 ([7, Lemma 2.16])**.** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a numerical semigroup minimally generated by three positive integers n_1, n_2, n_3 such that $\gcd(n_1, n_2, n_3) = 1$. Let $d = \gcd(n_1, n_2)$, and consider the numerical semigroup $\mathcal{T} = \langle \frac{n_1}{d}, \frac{n_2}{d}, n_3 \rangle$. Then*

$$F(\mathcal{S}) = dF(\mathcal{T}) + (d-1)n_3.$$

Let $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Assuming that n_1, n_2, n_3 are pairwise coprime, the sets $\langle n_j, n_k \rangle$ are numerical semigroups. Define the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_i = \{M \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \mid Mn_i \in \langle n_j, n_k \rangle\},$$

and define $c_i = \min \mathcal{S}_i \setminus \{0\}$; the integers c_i are the *minimal relations* discussed in the introduction.

This definition is well-posed, since clearly the product $n_j n_i$ belongs to $\langle n_j, n_k \rangle$; actually, this remark implies $c_i \leq \min\{n_j, n_k\}$. Notice that, in this context, the assumption that n_1, n_2, n_3 form a minimal system of generators for $\mathcal{S}$ is equivalent to $c_i > 1$, for every $i = 1, 2, 3$. Actually, since the sets $\langle n_j, n_k \rangle$ are numerical semigroups, clearly $Mn_i \in \langle n_j, n_k \rangle$ if M is large enough, i.e. $M \in \mathcal{S}_i$: thus $\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{S}_i$ is finite, and it is easy to check that $\mathcal{S}_i$ is a numerical semigroup.

X It is possible to characterize the sets $\mathcal{S}_i$ as sets of solutions of certain modular inequalities. In the following, we denote by $[m]_n$ the remainder of the Euclidean division of m by n.

Proposition 3 ([4, Corollary 2.2])**.** *Let n_1, n_2, n_3 be pairwise coprime positive integers.*

Then, with the notation fixed above, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_i = \{x \in \mathbb{N} \mid [x n_i n_k^{-1}]_{n_j} n_k \leq x n_i\}$$

for every $\{i,j,k\} = \{1,2,3\}$.

Several results (cf. [3],[6],[8]) provide simple formulas for $F(\langle n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle)$ as a function of n_1, n_2, n_3, the integers c_i and the coefficients of the linear combination that determines $c_i n_i$. The one we will use is a slight variation of a result by Johnson.

Theorem 4 ([4, Theorem 3.4])**.** *Let* $n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ *be pairwise coprime integers such that* $n_1 > n_2 > n_3 > 1$*, and let* $\mathcal{S} = \langle n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle$*. Then*

$$F(\mathcal{S}) = c_1 n_1 + \max\{[c_2 n_2 n_3^{-1}]_{n_1} n_3, [c_3 n_3 n_2^{-1}]_{n_1} n_2\} - n_1 - n_2 - n_3.$$

2. Main result

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a numerical semigroup minimally generated by three pairwise coprime positive integers n_1, n_2, n_3, and let $\{i,j,k\} = \{1,2,3\}$. Our approach will use the classical Theorem 1 to obtain n_i from the Frobenius number $F_i = F(\langle n_j, n_k\rangle) = n_j n_k - n_j - n_k$. Since $n_i \notin \langle n_j, n_k\rangle$, by Theorem 1 $n_j n_k - n_j - n_k - n_i \in \langle n_j, n_k\rangle$; therefore there exist $A, B \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n_j n_k - n_j - n_k - n_i = A n_j + B n_k$. From this equation we can deduce that there exist two positive integers $\lambda_{ij}, \lambda_{ik}$ such that $n_i = n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - \lambda_{ik} n_k$. By the hypothesis of pairwise coprimality, we can obtain $\lambda_{ij}, \lambda_{ik}$ from n_1, n_2, n_3, using the remainder operator. In fact, we have $-\lambda_{ij} n_j \equiv n_i \pmod{n_k}$, and, since clearly $\lambda_{ij} < n_k$, we get $\lambda_{ij} = [-n_i n_j^{-1}]_{n_k}$, and similarly $\lambda_{ik} = [-n_i n_k^{-1}]_{n_j}$. In order to simplify the notation, we state our results in function of $\lambda_{ij}, \lambda_{ik}$, and will compute them only in the statement of the main results.

The basic idea of our approach is to *travel* from F_i to n_i by subtracting $(\lambda_{ij} - 1)n_j$, and then $(\lambda_{ik} - 1)n_k$, while studying the behaviour of the sets $\mathcal{S}_i$ during each step. We start by subtracting $(\lambda_{ij} - 1)n_j$; denote by N_i the integer obtained after this first step, that is, $N_i = n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - n_k$. Also, define $\mathcal{T} = \langle n_j, n_k, N_i\rangle$ and denote by $\mathcal{T}_i, \mathcal{T}_j, \mathcal{T}_k$ the analogous of the sets $\mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{S}_j, \mathcal{S}_k$. Notice that $\gcd(N_i, n_j) = \gcd(n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - n_k, n_j) = \gcd(n_k, n_j) = 1$ and $\gcd(N_i, n_k) = \gcd(n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - n_k, n_j) = \gcd(n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - \lambda_{ik} n_k, n_j) = \gcd(n_i, n_k) = 1$: the integers n_j, n_k, N_i are thus pairwise coprime, and we fall in the hypothesis of the following Proposition.

Proposition 5. *Let* N_i, n_j, n_k *be pairwise coprime positive integers such that* $N_i = n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - n_k$*, with* $\lambda_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$*, and let* $\mathcal{T} = \langle n_j, n_k, N_i\rangle$*. Then*

(1) $c_j = n_k - \lambda_{ij}$.

(2) $c_k = n_j - \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor$*. Moreover, if we write* $x = \alpha n_j + \beta$*, with* $0 < \beta \leq n_j$*, we have that* $x \in \mathcal{T}_k$ *if and only if*

$$\beta \geq \frac{n_i - \alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} = n_j - \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}.$$

Proof. (1) Clearly

$$(n_k - \lambda_{ij}) n_j = n_k n_j - \lambda_{ij} n_j = n_i + n_k,$$

thus by the hypothesis of pairwise coprimality it follows that $c_j = n_k - \lambda_{ij}$.

(2) By Proposition 3 we have

$$\mathcal{T}_k = \{x \in \mathbb{N} \mid x n_k \geq [x n_k n_i^{-1}]_{n_j} n_i\}.$$

However, $n_i \equiv -n_k \pmod{n_j}$, implying $[xn_k x_i^{-1}]_{n_j} = [-x]_{n_j}$: therefore, we obtain that $x \in \mathcal{T}_k$ if and only if $xn_k \geq [-x]_{n_j} n_i$. Now, write $x = \alpha n_j + \beta$, with $0 < \beta \leq n_j$. It is easy to see that $[-x]_{n_j} = n_j - \beta$, hence $\alpha n_j + \beta \in \mathcal{T}_k$ if and only if

$$(\alpha n_j + \beta) n_k \geq (n_j - \beta) n_i \Longrightarrow (n_k + n_i)\beta \geq (n_i - \alpha n_k) n_j.$$

Since $n_i + n_k = n_j(n_k - \lambda_{ij})$ we obtain

$$\beta \geq \frac{n_i - \alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} = n_j - \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}},$$

which is the second part of our thesis. Finally, taking $\alpha = 0$ we deduce

$$c_k = n_j - \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor.$$

□

Notice that, when we subtract multiples of n_j, the behaviour of the associated integer c_j is very simple. For this reason, since we have yet to subtract multiples of n_k, we focused on the set $\mathcal{T}_k$, in the hope that we can control this set during the second step.

Luckily, this turns out to be the case. Going back to the general case, the following Proposition links the sets $\mathcal{S}_k$ and $\mathcal{T}_k$.

Proposition 6. *With the notation fixed above, we have* $\mathcal{S}_k = \{x - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)[-x]_{n_j} | x \in \mathcal{T}_k\}$.

Proof. Take $x \in \mathcal{S}_k$. Then xn_k can be expressed as a linear combination of n_j and n_i, say $xn_k = An_j + Bn_i$, with $A, B \in \mathbb{N}$; actually, we can further assume without loss of generality that $0 \leq B < n_j$. Since $N_i - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)n_k = n_i$, we get

$$xn_k = An_j + Bn_i \Longleftrightarrow [x + B(\lambda_{ik} - 1)]n_k = An_j + BN_i, \tag{1}$$

hence $x + B(\lambda_{ik} - 1) \in \mathcal{T}_k$. Then for every $x \in \mathcal{S}_k$ there exists $x' \in \mathcal{T}_k$ such that $x'n_k = A'n_j + B'N_i$, with $0 \leq B' < n_j$ and $x = x' - B'(\lambda_{ik} - 1)$. Conversely, it is obvious that if $x' \in \mathcal{T}_k$ is such that $x'n_k = A'n_j + B'N_i$, with $0 \leq B' < n_j$, then $x' - B'(\lambda_{ik} - 1) \in \mathcal{S}_k$ (notice that $A', B' \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $x' - B'(\lambda_{ik} - 1) \in \mathbb{N}$). Therefore, we have obtained the following relation:

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \{x - B(\lambda_{ik} - 1) \ | x \in \mathcal{T}_k, xn_k = An_j + BN_i, A \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq B < n_j\}.$$

In order to conclude the proof, we deduce the coefficient B of the previous relation in function of x: in fact, recalling that $N_i \equiv -n_k \pmod{n_j}$, from $xn_k \equiv BN_i \pmod{n_j}$ we obtain $-x \equiv B \pmod{n_j}$, thus $0 \leq B < n_j$ forces $B = [-x]_{n_j}$, which is our thesis. □

This result shows that the final configuration of the set $\mathcal{S}_k$ depends only on the composition of the set $\mathcal{T}_k$ and the number $\lambda_{ik} - 1$ of multiples of n_k that divide the two generators N_i and n_i. Since the set $\mathcal{T}_k$ is fully determined by Proposition 5, combining Propositions 5 and 6 we prove our main result, that is, c_k is the minimum element of a well-defined finite set. We state this result in its full generality.

Theorem 7. *Let n_1, n_2, n_3 be three pairwise coprime positive integers which are the minimal generators of the numerical semigroup $\mathcal{S} = \langle n_1, n_2, n_3 \rangle$. Then, for every $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, we have*

$$c_k = \min_{\alpha=1,\dots,I_k} \left\{ \alpha n_j - [-n_i n_k^{-1}]_{n_j} \left\lfloor \alpha \frac{n_k}{[n_i n_j^{-1}]_{n_k}} \right\rfloor \right\}$$

where $I_k = \left\lceil [-n_i n_k^{-1}]_{n_j} \frac{[n_i n_j^{-1}]_{n_k}}{n_i} \right\rceil$.

Proof. By Proposition 6 $\mathcal{S}_k = \{x - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)[-x]_{n_j} | x \in \mathcal{T}_k\}$. However, from Proposition 5 we have that an integer $\alpha n_j + \beta$, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \beta \leq n_j$, belongs to $\mathcal{T}_k$ if and only if

$$\beta \geq n_j - \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}. \tag{2}$$

Now, write $x \in \mathcal{T}_k$ as $x = \alpha n_j + \beta$, with $0 < \beta \leq n_j$. Then $[-x]_{n_j} = [-\beta]_{n_j} = n_j - \beta$, and

$$x - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)[-x]_{n_j} = \alpha n_j + \beta - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)(n_j - \beta) = (\alpha + 1 - \lambda_{ik})n_j + \lambda_{ik}\beta. \tag{3}$$

Therefore, for each interval $\mathcal{I}_\alpha = [\alpha n_j + 1, \alpha n_j + n_j]$, the element $\tilde{x} = \alpha n_j + \tilde{\beta} \in \mathcal{T}_k \cap \mathcal{I}_\alpha$ such that $x - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)[-x]_{n_j}$ is minimal is the one with the smallest admissibile remainder, which is, in light of (2), $\tilde{\beta} = n_j - \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor$.

Putting this value in (3) yields

$$x - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)[-x]_{n_j} = (\alpha + 1 - \lambda_{ik})n_j + \lambda_{ik} \left(n_j - \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \right) = (\alpha+1)n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor.$$

Now, since $c_k = \min \mathcal{S}_k$ we deduce

$$c_k = \min \mathcal{S}_k \setminus \{0\} = \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}} \{\min\{x - (\lambda_{ik} - 1)[-x]_{n_j} \mid x \in \mathcal{T}_k \cap I_\alpha)\}\} =$$

$$= \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ (\alpha+1)n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \right\} = \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \left\{ \alpha n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \right\}.$$

Since $n_k - \lambda_{ij} = n_k - [-n_i n_j^{-1}]_{n_k} = [n_i n_j^{-1}]_{n_k}$, we are left to prove that if $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is such that $c_k = \alpha n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor$, then $\tilde{\alpha} \leq \left\lceil \lambda_{ik} \frac{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}{n_i} \right\rceil$. For this purpose, we distinguish two possible cases:

(1) $n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \geq \lambda_{ik}$.

Recall that the floor function satisfies $\lfloor A + B \rfloor \leq \lfloor A \rfloor + \lfloor B \rfloor + 1$ for every $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^+$. By this property, we have that

$$\lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor = \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} + \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \leq \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor + \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor + \lambda_{ik}.$$

Therefore, for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we obtain

$$(\alpha+1)n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha+1)n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \geq (\alpha+1)n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor - \lambda_{ik} \geq$$

$$\geq \alpha n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor,$$

and hence by definition of c_k if follows $\tilde{\alpha} = 1 \leq \left\lceil \lambda_{ik} \frac{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}{n_i} \right\rceil$.

(2) $n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor < \lambda_{ik}$.
For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we have

$$\alpha n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \geq \alpha n_j - \lambda_{ik} \frac{\alpha n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} = \frac{\alpha n_i}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}.$$

Assume now that $\tilde{\alpha} > \left\lceil \lambda_{ik} \frac{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}{n_i} \right\rceil \geq \lambda_{ik} \frac{n_k - \lambda_{ij}}{n_i}$. Then

$$c_k = \tilde{\alpha} n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{\tilde{\alpha} n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor \geq \frac{\tilde{\alpha} n_i}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \geq \lambda_{ik}.$$

However, considering $\alpha = 1$ we obtain $n_j - \lambda_{ik} \left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor < \lambda_{ik} \leq c_k$, which contradicts the definition of c_k.

□

Since we do not place any condition (besides the ones stated at the beginning) on the triple $\{n_i, n_j, n_k\}$, we obtain, for each of the integers c_1, c_2, c_3, two similar formulas, according to the choice of the indexes i, j. Putting these formulas in Theorem 4 yields an (atrociously long) exact formula for $F(\langle n_1, n_2, n_3 \rangle)$, under the general assumption $n_1 > n_2 > n_3$. Our choice (which we will motivate in the final Section) goes as follow:

(1) Deduce c_1 with the position $i = 3, j = 2, k = 1$, obtaining

$$c_1 = \min_{\alpha = 1, \ldots, I_1} \left\{ \alpha n_2 - [-n_3 n_1^{-1}]_{n_2} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_1}{[n_3 n_2^{-1}]_{n_1}} \right\rfloor \right\},$$

where $I_1 = \left\lceil [-n_3 n_1^{-1}]_{n_2} \frac{[n_3 n_2^{-1}]_{n_1}}{n_3} \right\rceil$.

(2) Compute c_2 with the position $i = 3, j = 1, k = 2$. We have

$$c_2 = \min_{\beta = 1, \ldots, I_2} \left\{ \beta n_1 - [-n_3 n_2^{-1}]_{n_1} \left\lfloor \frac{\beta n_2}{[n_3 n_1^{-1}]_{n_2}} \right\rfloor \right\},$$

where $I_2 = \left\lceil [-n_3 n_2^{-1}]_{n_1} \frac{[n_3 n_1^{-1}]_{n_2}}{n_3} \right\rceil$.

(3) Compute c_3 with the position $i = 2, j = 1, k = 3$, obtaining

$$c_3 = \min_{\gamma = 1, \ldots, I_3} \left\{ \gamma n_1 - [-n_2 n_3^{-1}]_{n_1} \left\lfloor \frac{\gamma n_3}{[n_2 n_1^{-1}]_{n_3}} \right\rfloor \right\},$$

where $I_3 = \left\lceil [-n_2 n_3^{-1}]_{n_1} \frac{[n_2 n_1^{-1}]_{n_3}}{n_2} \right\rceil$.

At this point, Theorem 4 returns the following formula.

Theorem 8. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a numerical semigroup minimally generated by three pairwise coprime positive integers n_1, n_2, n_3 such that $n_1 > n_2 > n_3$. Then*

$$F(\mathcal{S}) = \min_{\alpha = 1, \ldots, I_1} \left\{ \alpha n_2 - [-n_3 n_1^{-1}]_{n_2} \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha n_1}{[n_3 n_2^{-1}]_{n_1}} \right\rfloor \right\} n_1 +$$

$$+\max\left\{\left[\min_{\beta=1,\dots,I_2}\left\{\beta n_1-[-n_3n_2^{-1}]_{n_1}\left\lfloor\frac{\beta n_2}{[n_3n_1^{-1}]_{n_2}}\right\rfloor\right\}n_2n_3^{-1}\right]_{n_1}n_3,\right.$$

$$\left.\left[\min_{\gamma=1,\dots,I_3}\left\{\gamma n_1-[-n_2n_3^{-1}]_{n_1}\left\lfloor\frac{\gamma n_3}{[n_2n_1^{-1}]_{n_3}}\right\rfloor\right\}n_3n_2^{-1}\right]_{n_1}n_2\right\}-n_1-n_2-n_3,$$

where $I_1=\left\lceil[-n_3n_1^{-1}]_{n_2}\frac{[n_3n_2^{-1}]_{n_1}}{n_3}\right\rceil$, $I_2=\left\lceil[-n_3n_2^{-1}]_{n_1}\frac{[n_3n_1^{-1}]_{n_2}}{n_3}\right\rceil$ *and* $I_3=\left\lceil[-n_2n_3^{-1}]_{n_1}\frac{[n_2n_1^{-1}]_{n_3}}{n_2}\right\rceil$.

3. Conclusions

Clearly, the formula of Theorem 8 is mainly a theoretical exercise, whose utility is to directly highlight the complexity of the Diophantine Frobenius problem and the extremely irregular behaviour of $F(\langle n_1,n_2,n_3\rangle)$; it does not give generic bounds, or asymptotic results. However, it may prove useful as a computable formula that gives $F(\mathcal{S})$ only in function of the generators: in fact, since the modular parts of the form $\lambda_{ij}=[-n_in_j^{-1}]_{n_k}$ repeat themselves in the formula, it may sound preferable to compute them once at the beginning, and use them directly in this formula, rather than compute them each time we recall a function based on Theorem 7. In particular, notice that the choice that led to Theorem 8 allows us to compute only four of these λ_{ij}, rather than six.

On the other hand, Theorem 7 may have practical uses (although it is still susceptible to improvements) and provides some insight on the problem. In general, the integer c_k is defined as the minimum positive integer satisfying a certain modular inequality (cf. Proposition 3); in Theorem 7, this condition disappeared; another advantage is that the set containing c_k is finite and computable. Moreover, by looking at the formula, the most complex part seems to be the computation of the modular moltiplicative inverse of n_k modulo n_j, which has the same complexity as the extended Euclidean algorithm. However, since these modular inverses do not involve α, they have to be computed only once.

Moreover, the complexity of the computation of c_1,c_2,c_3 can be reduced by using some tricks. For instance, it is possible to rotate the indexes $\{i,j,k\}$ in a way that allows to use the same inverses for two different integers c_k (see the choice that led to Theorem 8). Another possible choice is to fix k and then take the choice of i,j such that the number of iterations required is minimal.

Probably, it is possible to compute the value of α that gives c_k, thus improving Theorem 8: however, it seems that investigating this α with elementary methods would only lead to an even more convoluted result. At least, continuing in that direction will require a new idea.

In some particular settings, Theorem 7 can be presented in a simplified form. One of these has already been considered in the proof of Theorem 7.

Corollary 9. *With the notation used in Theorem 7, if* $n_j\geq[-n_in_k^{-1}]_{n_j}\left(\left\lfloor\frac{n_k}{[n_in_j^{-1}]_{n_k}}\right\rfloor+1\right)$, *we have*

$$c_k=n_j-[-n_in_k^{-1}]_{n_j}\left\lfloor\frac{n_k}{[n_in_j^{-1}]_{n_k}}\right\rfloor.$$

This last corollary can simplify the computation if $\lambda_{ik}, \lambda_{ij}$ are small enough: for instance, if $\lambda_{ij} < \frac{n_k}{2}$ and $\lambda_{ik} < \frac{n_j}{2}$, $n_j - \lambda_{ik}\left\lfloor \frac{n_k}{n_k - \lambda_{ij}} \right\rfloor = n_j - \lambda_{ik} \geq \lambda_{ik}$, thus we can compute the two minimal relations c_k and (swapping j and k) c_j by Corollary 9, speeding up the process.

The hypotheses of Corollary 9 are not always satisfied (see for example $n_1 = 12, n_2 = 11, n_3 = 7$); but, since $0 < n_i = n_j n_k - \lambda_{ij} n_j - \lambda_{ik} n_k$ we must have either $\lambda_{ij} < \frac{n_k}{2}$ or $\lambda_{ik} < \frac{n_j}{2}$. Thus, since $0 < \lambda_{ij} < n_k$ and $0 < \lambda_{ik} < n_j$, it is easy to understand that Corollary 9 can be applied for a large number of triples.

References

1. A. Brauer, *On a problem of partitions*, Am. J. Math. 64 (1942), 299-312.
2. F. Curtis, *On formulas for the Frobenius number of a numerical semigroup*, Math. Scand. 67 (1990), 190-192.
3. S. M. Johnson, *A linear Diophantine Problem*, Can. J. Math., 12 (1960), 390-398.
4. A. Moscariello, *The first elements of the quotient of a numerical semigroup by a positive integer*, Semigroup Forum **90/1** (2015), 126-134.
5. H. Murakami, *A continued fraction type method to find a rational number in a given closed interval whose denominator is minimal*, ACM Commun. Comput. Algebra **43** No. 3 (2009), 88-90.
6. J. L. Ramírez Alfonsín, *The Diophantine Frobenius Problem*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2005).
7. J. C. Rosales, P. A. García Sánchez, *Numerical Semigroups*, Springer (2009).
8. J.C. Rosales, P. A. García-Sánchez, *Numerical semigroups with embedding dimension three*, Arch. Math. **83**, 488496 (2004).
9. J. C. Rosales, P. Vasco, *The smallest integer that is solution of a proportionally modular Diophantine equation*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **11** No. 2 (2008), 203-212.
10. J. J. Sylvester, *Mathematical questions with their solutions*, Educational Times, 41 (1884).

(Alessio Moscariello) Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Catania, Viale Andrea Doria 6, 95125 Catania,Italy

E-mail address: alessio.moscariello@studium.unict.it